DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 156 HE 015 599

AUTHOR Kimble, Gregory A.
TITLE Workshop for New Psychology Chairmen: 1971 is a New Scene.
PUB DATE 5 Sep 71
NOTE 15p.; Background paper for "Workshop for New Chairmen," Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology, American Psychological Association (Washington, DC, September 5, 1971).

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Administrator Role; Budgeting; College Instruction; College Role; *Department Heads; Departments; Federal Aid; *Financial Problems; *Graduate Study; Higher Education; Operating Expenses; *Psychology; Research; Resource Allocation; Teacher Administrator Relationship

ABSTRACT

A report prepared as background material for the 1971 workshop for new chairmen of graduate departments of psychology focuses on financial concerns. It is suggested that with disappearing grant support, universities will have to pick up the salaries of faculty members. Programs such as minority group studies will generate fiscal demands that will be difficult to meet. Department heads must deal with the prospect of operating on a decreasing budget on a long-term basis and will have to fight to maintain present budgets. Important to the department head's work will be the reassessment of priorities regarding graduate versus undergraduate education and research versus teaching. It is suggested that in many universities, graduate instruction and research are the losers and that the department head is likely to have to seek outside support. Federal support for research and graduate training is still available but more difficult to obtain. The squeeze on personnel funds has led to drastic changes in the pattern of funding graduate students, including admitting more students without stipends and dividing teaching assistantships for two or more students. Changes have also occurred in respect to academic values, and there has been a new emphasis on teaching as opposed to research, a notion that graduate programs should be reduced and modified in order to meet societal demands, and an anti-intellectual atmosphere that would substitute feeling for reason and action for research. Ways that the department head can economize include allocating funds to subdivisions within the departments and distinguishing between personal and departmental business. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Gregory A. Kimble

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED222156

HE 015 599

WORKSHOP FOR NEW PSYCHOLOGY CHAIRMEN

1971 is a New Scene

Gregory A. Kimble
University of Colorado

In preparing this report I proceeded as I did last year, adding just one minor but informative innovation. First I sent a brief questionnaire to all present chairmen of Psychology Departments in the United States and Canada asking for three pieces of information: (a) The names of any new chairmen they might know about, (b) major problems encountered during the year and (c) attempted solutions to these problems together with some record of success or failure. As the names of new chairmen became available I wrote to them (this was the innovation) asking about their concerns and for suggestions of workshop topics. The answers I received raised questions about recruiting, retention and promotion, faculty evaluation and finding time for scholarly work. These, it turns out, are last year's problems; they are of fundamental importance but they are not the problems that will lead the parade in next year's excercise in coping. Hence the subtitle of this report: "1971 is a new scene."

The Root of Most of It

As with most evils, money (really the lack of it) is at the root of most of the problems the new (and old) chairman will be facing in 1971-72. It is important first to put this point in perspective. Responsible economic analysts believe that support for universities may not improve greatly in the near future even, for example, with the termination of the

Vietnam war. Inflation will continue to take its toll but, beyond that, there are too many competing claims on public funds -- for pollution control, urban renewal, public transportation, and improving the quality of life in general. The money to meet all of these needs is simply not available. In the mean time events on the campuses of the country have done little to assure that the universities will receive a disproportionately large share of the funds available. This is especially clear in the case of the state universities. Legislatures have responded to their problems with an attitude that falls somewhere on the dimension from apathy to antipathy. Status quo budgets and even reductions have occurred as a result. The private universities are beset with problems that are at least as difficult. Endowment income will not stretch to cover operating expenses. Alumni have cut back on contributions. Tuition increases do not keep pace with increased costs of education. All of this, of course, has taken place against a background of sharply diminished Federal support of the universities.

The Situation with Respect to University Budgets

This critical budgetary situation has had a profound effect upon university functioning in two rather different ways. There has been, first of all, a curtailment of expansion in almost every area, the commonest exception being enrollment and this adds to the problems. In many ways an even more frustrating consequence has been a sharp decrease in flexibility. Temporary freezes on the hiring of faculty and secretarial personnel have been very common during the past year. The apparent reason for this has been that budgetary decisions have been difficult to make at the upper administrative levels. To take an important example of what happened

(and probably will again next year) personnel paid for on soft Federal money posed this king of problem: Federal funding of grants was late and there was some fear that approval might not be fothcoming even of applications for previously awarded continuation funds. If such money did not become available the salaries of many faculty members paid on training ggants for example would suddenly become the responsibility of the university. This prospect made it impossible to commit money to replace departing faculty because the funds might be needed to pick up soft money positions. This led to the so-called "freezes".

For this and a host of related problems the only possible initial means of coping was impatient waiting. Half a dozen chairmen used nearly identical expressions in describing their dealings with the Dean in these matters: "I cried a lot and eventually we worked something out". It seems likely, however, that things will not "work out" in the future unless there is an important change in the financial conditions of the universittes. Inflation will continue. Grant support will disappear when currently committed support runs out, leaving universities to pick up the salaries of faculty members and fractions of faculty members who had been paid on soft money. Now programs (e.g., minority group studies, ecologically oriented institutes) will generate fiscal demands faster than decreases in other programs can release funds for them. In short many of us are going to have to face the prospect of living on at best a stabilized (therefore decreasing) budget on a long-term basis. Moreover it is important to understand that we may even have to fight to maintain our present budgets.

It seems plain that 1971-72 will see the making of fiscal decisions in many universities that will have a long-range influence on departmental

budgets. Although these decisions are usually made on a year-to-year basis, one year's budget tends to set the pattern for the next. As a result of tightened budgets many university administrators are now in the process of doing what they call "re-assessing priorities", a phrase that translates into "deciding which budgets can be cut in order to maintain others at present levels." The budgets of spcyhology departments will not be exempt from this analysis. In time like these old patterms may be broken and what happens now will set the probably level of support for years in the future.

Unfortunately the new chairman is apt to be in a poor position to negotiate with the administration for funds. He simply does not have the detailed acquaintance with the budget that he will need. None of the respondents to my questionnaire saw the problem in exactly these terms so the only advice I can offer is my own. It would be to make a careful study of the departmental budget the very first order of business for the new chairman. Try to know where last year's money went, where the budget was particularly short and where, if anywhere, there may have been a surplus. Keep tabs on current expenditures so that you will know in detail where your probeems are. I would call upon the advice of your predecessor as chairman if he is available. Make yourself acquainted with the budgetary information supplied through the asupices of the Council of Graduate Chairmen. In short leave no stone unturned that will prepare you to make a strong but realistic case for your need for funds. At the same time, you should be embarking upon a campaign to obtain additional funds from other sources.

External Support

In the reassessment of priorities mentioned above graduate vs. under-

graduate education and research vs. teaching are figuring in the process lamost everywhere and in various ways. (I will deal with other aspects of these issues later in this report.) It is quite apparent that, in many universities, graduate instruction and research ~~XXXXX~~ are the losers in the competition. It is in these areas that the chairman is apt to have to seek out side support.

Federal support for research and graduate training is still available but it is harder to get for two reasons: (1) Because of limited funds a much smaller percentage of applications that are approved can be funded. (2) National priorities (alcoholism, urban problems, child development, etc.) figure importantly in the determination of exactly what is funded. Such considerations have always played an essential role but ~~XX~~ the current priorities are somewhat different from those of a decade ago and they are applied in a more explicit fashion. In spite of all this it should be emphasized that support <u>is</u> available. The deparmtnet chairman should be working harder than ever to obtain such support because he will find it even more valuable than in the past.

The importance of outside support has not gone unrecognized in most departments. And in at least some formal arrangements have been made to assist in experienced faculty members in obtaining it. A faculty member with a history of successful grantsmanship is assigned the task of reviewing departmental applications, helping to improve them and determinign that the cost of the research is covered by the proposed budget. This last-mentioned determination is particularly important in the area of supplies which, if not covered by the grant, once approvaed, will come from the most beleaguered segment of the departmental budget. Presumably the person who assumes this responsibility received some reward for doing it. A reduction of one course per year would seem appropriate.

Ways to Economize

Some economes are going to be forced upon you. These will occur first in the area of personnel. To illustrate one of these, last year many of my respondents raised issues related to the hiring of distinguished full professors. This year not a single chairman was having this problem. The reason clearly is that the recruiting of expensive faculty has come to a halt. At the University of Colorado, where data are available to me, for example, something like 20 new positions were filled. Of these all but t hree or four were at the level of beginning Assistant Professor. Two of the more advanced appointments were minority group candidates. These 20 appointments were to replace several full professors who retired as well as a number of other advanced people.

A related economy involves part-time and temporary personnel. Here two oppositve patterns have developed. In some universities there has been an increased reliance upon such faculty because they are very much less costly than regularly appointment faculty. In others part-time people have been dismissed so that the university saves the relatively small cost. Neither of these courses of action is particularly desirable. The first tends to prevent the strengthening of departments by the recruiting of new faculty. The second puts pressure on existing faculty to increase their teaching loads.

Behind this state of affairs there is an important distinction that the chairman should understand. Whereas we think of appointments in terms of "slots", university administrators think in terms of dollars. They have to because that's the way their budgets come, except in a few cases where a state legislature has line-by-line (that is position-by-position) power over the budget. This means then that the replacement of a $20,000 full professor with a $10,000 assistant professor will release funds to pay the entire salary of a second new assistant professor. Similar considerations apply with respect to secretaries, shop personnel, research technicians, animal caretakers and janitors.

In this connection, there is a point about minority-group faculty to keep in mind. They receive higher salaries than other faculty and, seen in terms of dollars, this could conceivably affect the income of every member of the department. The chairman should argue for special appropriations, that sometimes can be obtained through minority-group programs, to pay the difference between a minority-group salary and a usual one.

The squeeze on personnel funds has led to some drastic changes in the pattern of funding graduate students. Many departments are admitting more students without stipends and the chairmen involved are worrying about the implications. Teaching assistanships have been divided and assigned to two or more students. Both of these procedures lead to a relatively larger graduate student group than would be possible with funds allocated as they would have been a couple of years ago. The consequences of this for later placement of students is the source of worry for the chairman. This is a problem I will deal with later.

As in the past, the chairman's most persistent money problems are with inadequate bedugets for supplies and equipment. Some hew patterns of dealing

with these problems are emerging. In general they boil down to a concept of individual accountability in this area. In an extreme case such funds were simply divided equally among faculty who were expected to use them in ways that would stretch them through the fiscal year. In other cases faculty members were asked for an estimate of their needs and funds were allocated in terms of these requests. It is not clear yet how well these schemes have worked out. The obvious dangers are: (1) Many faculty members will not be able to produce a realistic projection of needs. (2) Complete allocation of funds eliminates the flexibility that will be needed to meet emergencies (3) Some funds will be required to meet general departmental needs and these must be considered (4) In a large department the system would be certain to be cumbersome and probably take more to administer than it would save.

A more realistic solution may be to allocate funds to subdivisions within deraptments (training areas, undergraduate education, graduate education, the clinic or counselling center, the honors program, etc.) making the administrators for these functions responsible for accounting. Some such procedure seems essential both for monitoring current expenditures and for future planning.

Another form of economizing that seems sure to be required will involve making a sharper distinction than has been necessary before between personal and departmental business. It does not seem unreasonable to require faculty and graduate students to pay for supplies and services required for such items as personal correspoddence, books written for personal profit, and the operation of extra-university business. Obviously the distinction cannot be completely rigid. A scholarly book may be a major contribution to departmental purposes and may deserve support as such. And probably almost

any publicational activity contributes something of this sort. But where personal rather than university gains seem likely personal payment for costs seems appropriate.

A similar state of affairs exists with respect to activities carried out under research grants and contracts. As mentioned earlier it is important to make sure that grant applications are written to cover the costs of research. Actually this is not hard to accomplish. It is often much more difficult to assure the expenditure of funds in the ways outlined in the application. It is often simpler and sometines cheaper to obtain supplies, Xerox copies and small items of equipment through the department. If this practice makes sense in a particular context there is almost certainly a way to transfer funds from a research account to a departmental account. Investigations with funds available should be required to make appropriate contribution.

In particular the chairman should keep an eye on the operation of institutes if they exist in his university. If usually makes a difference whether a research grant is obtained through an institute rather than the department. For example the institute rather than the department will receive whatever fraction of overhead is turned by to the sponsoring unit of the university. Most of the time such sponsorship is probably determined on sound bases. But: (1) Be sure it is and (2) take steps to make sure that institute activities do not absorb departmental monies.

Finally, economies (perhaps of considerable magnitude) can be effected by a department-wide coooerative approach to certain problems. Items that sometimes must come from departmental budgets include moving furniture within a building, the cost of delivery, a film from the department that distributes audio-visual aids, the operation of the university mail room, losses from the library, storage of ususued equipment, apparatus repair, classroom supplies

such as Xeroxed copies of readings (which incidentally may well be illegal), meals consumed on recruiting visits and laundering lab coats. Each of these items will suggest ways of saving money by having students and faculty bear small burdens. Those of us who were graduate students or faculty members before 1950 will find the implication of this to be nothing more than a return to ways of operating then. To our younger colleagues they may come a stern reminder that life is real.

Problems with Academic Values

Although shortages of funds are immediately responsible for most of the chairman's current problems, the money problems occur in, and perhaps in turn are caused by, an attitudinal context. The salient features of this context appear to include an emphasis on teaching as ppposed to research, a belief that the ivory tower is a house of ill repute and that faculty activities should have social relevance, the notion that graduate programs should be reduced and modified in order to meet the demand of society and, in some quarters, an anti-intellectual atmosphere that would substitute feeling for reason and action for research.

The New Emphasis on Teaching

University administrators have discovered the computer and have used it to summarize teaching loads and class sizes, to project demands for courses and programs, to compute cost per student credit hour, and to figure space allocations for faculty and various university functions. In the process the initials IRS (Institutional Research Services) have acquired a negative connotation that may soon match (in academic circles) feelings toward the other IRS.

What is objectionable in such activities, of course, is that they tend to stress the importance of one university function (undergraduate teaching) and, by implication, to depreciate another (research). The threat in this to traditional academic values is something that most chairmen who raised the issue think should be resisted.

Before looking at some ways of dealing with the various consequences of this new emphasis it is important to understand the main features of the teaching function that the computerized analysis reveals: (1) Lower division courses are huge; enrollments in the thousands are common in general psychology courses. (2) Upper division courses are relatively even more heavily overenrolled -- 100-200 students in courses intended for 25-30. (3) Graduate offerings typically contain many courses with enrollments of only 2 or 3. It is no small wonder that the notion of using teaching talent now devoted to graduate work for undergraduate instruction. These data and other pressures as well are also leading to an assault on the concept of the standard teaching load.

Teaching loads and student-credit-hour production. Presure for an increased teaching load is developing in two ways: (1) Legislators who do not understand how the academic people spend their time are ca-ling for the professors to put in a fu-l week's work and that they not be allowed to get away with a mere six hour of service. (2) Financial problems are arguing for a program that will limit faculty size and, at the same time, cope with risimg enrollments and increased demands for courses in the social sciences (which usually includes psychology) and the humanities. The implications of thesd two different pressures are quite different.

In the matter of how a faculty member spends his time it is clear that the past decades have seen a not very subtle shift in the definition of faculty work loads that must be recognized and faced. At one time the standard teaching load was 9 or 12 hours for everyone. Leter on this 12 load was reduced specifically

for administrative responsibilities and research. In this way the relatively standard load became 6 hours. When we hired new people most of us emphasized the importance of research and younger men were automatically granted the reduction in teaching hours to allow for research. A few generations of this practice is what led to the redefinition. Now the standard load is 6 hours with research being something that the faculty member does if he has time and feels like it. Some don't!

The existence of faculty members who teach their 6 hours and do nothing else is, of course, recognized by university administrators. As a result, a reassessment of teaching loads is now under in many institutions. This may eventuate in the reestablishment of the old policy under which the lightened load must be defended. There is some feeling that such a trend might not be something to resist. An increased teaching load might do something to encourage the non-contributors to look for other positions.

The financial pressures are what have led to course by course analyses of the cost of instruction and to recommendations for economizing on graduate education. In this case it is important for the departmental chairman to do several things: (1) he should keep in touch with enrollments in courses. (2) If some courses have low enrollments he should find out why. (3) He should be prepared to use these reasons to justify the low enrollment if he can. (4) If not justirication can be developed he should consider offering the course on an every--other-year schedule and in this way hope that the demand for the course will generate a defensible enrollment.

At a more general level it seems certain that these pressures for requiring every faculty member to handle a certain minimal number of student credit hours will continue. There appear to be three possible consequences of failure to deal withthe problem: (1) Faculty presently teaching few students will have to teach more but in the present number of courses. (2) All faculty may have to carry more courses. (3) When a faculty member who is unproductive in this sense leaves it may be hard to justify his replacement. The alternatives are listed in increasing order of unattractiveness. The fact that all of them do violence to the high value we all place on research does not mean that we should simply ignore the situation in the hope that it will go away.

Naturally we as chairmen should continue to fight the good fight. But economics are probably stronger than we are and we may in the end have to settle for the least of three evils.

Graduate vs. Undergraduate Education. Another source of pressure on the size of graduate courses derives from the belief that the job situation in the field is desperate. We cannot go on producing Ph.D.s who produce more Ph.D.s who produce more Ph.D.s ad infinitum according to this point of view. The job market simply will not absorb them. There are two ore three points to make here: (1) The situation in psychology is less difficult than in the more basic sciences. Jobs exist but choice jobs are scarce. This statement is on the basis of my own analysis of job announcements coming to my office. I will not present details, however, because Kenneth Little, Executive Officer of APA, is collecting more comprehensive information that shoulc be available soon. Many of our Ph.D.s will not be producing Ph.D.s because they will not find jobs in Ph.D. producting institutions. (2) It seems clear that the newest Ph.D. programs will be reconsidered in some universities and more of them will be cancelled. (3) The whole concept of the function of graduate education is at issue.

The initial reaction of Chairmen to the increasing difficulties of placing new Ph.D.s in satisfactory jobs has been to consider, at least, cutting back on the size of the graduate progam. As a result of decreased support for graduate students this has already happened in many departments. A second reaction to the situation is already apparent, however. It is to recognize the scholarly orietation of graduate education and to take the position that graduate programs must continue if scholarships and research are to survive. Chairmen who have arrived at this conclusion advocate being candid with students, advising them that the job situation is difficult and promising them only an education. From the information available it is difficult to tell how frequently departments have decided to stick by their academic guts. A good many departments are already altering progr-ms to meet the demands of the market place. Several chairmen reported that their departments are in the process of developing technical MA and Ph.D programs whose products will be easier to place

than the typical graduate of such programs. These special programs include training in behavior therapy, teaching, industrial psychology and clinical practice.

Civil Liberties. All of this is taking place against a background of increased sensitivity to the demands of students and society for relevance, meaningfulness, and regard for human rights. Because they are intangibles the problems arising are difficult.

Action vs. Scholarship. The chairman who put this problem most strongly referred to "younger faculty who confuse civil liberties with academic values." Others mentioned problems with encounter groups, action research, student dissatisfaction with traditional courses. Some referred to a deemphasis on research at the level of the Ph.D. dissertation. At the present time these seem just to be problems. No pattern of solution has yet emerged.

Minority Groups. The commitment of most universities to the appointment of minority group faculty and students has led to several problems: (1) In the case of faculty the biggest problem is that qualified minority group people are scarce. When located they command salaries that are at least 10%-20% higher than normal. Both recruiting and the cost of successful recruiting put a strain on the budget. (2) Except in the case of women, qualified minority-group graduate students are also hard to find. In this case a rather common pattern seems to emerge. It involves (2) relaxing admissions standards for Black and Mexican-American students. Specifically this tends to mean disregarding the GRE in admissions. It is commonly seen as an instrumentality of White Middle Class society. (b) a commitment to the student of two years (rather than one) of financial backing during which the hope is that deficiencies in the student's preparation can be corrected. It is still too early to evaluate these programs. (3) A third set of problems arises from the characteristic operating style of radical groups. Two or three chairmen advocate unusual care in dealings with minority groups. Small issues have been magnifed and major ones have been distorted.